

gmt@nrtw.org

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Underlying Decisions From Which the Petition Arises was filed via the Court's ECF system and that the following parties were either served via the Court's CM/ECF system and by U.S. Mail:

David Habenstreit  
Elizabeth Heaney  
Barbra Sheehy  
National Labor Relations Board  
1015 Half Street, SE  
appellatecourt@nlrb.gov  
Elizabeth.heaney@nlrb.gov  
Barbara.sheehy@nlrb.gov

A. John Harper,  
Art Carter,  
Littler Mendelson, P.C.  
1301 McKinney Street,  
Suite 1900  
Houston, TX 77002  
AJHarper@littler.com  
ATCarter@littler.com

William Haller  
Counsel for the Union  
International Association of Machinists  
9000 Machinists Place  
Upper Marlboro, MD 20772-2687  
whaller@iamaw.org

Date: February 19, 2019

By: /s/ Aaron B. Solem  
Aaron B. Solem

# EXHIBIT A

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD**

**LEGGETT & PLATT, INC.**

**and**

**Cases 09-CA-194057  
09-CA-196426  
09-CA-196608**

**INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS  
AND AEROSPACE WORKERS (IAM), AFL-CIO**

**ORDER**

Assuming that the Proposed-Intervenor's Exceptions 2 through 5 constitute a timely appeal from a ruling of an administrative law judge under Section 102.26 of the Board's Rules and Regulations, we deny that appeal on the merits. We find that the judge did not act arbitrarily or capriciously or otherwise abuse his discretion in denying the Proposed-Intervenor's motion to intervene. *See Veritas Health Services, Inc.*, 363 NLRB No. 108, slip op. at 1 fn.1 (2016); *Latino Express, Inc.*, 360 NLRB 911, 911 fn.2 (2014).<sup>1</sup>

IT IS ORDERED that the Proposed-Intervenor's appeal from the judge's adverse ruling with regard to intervention is denied.

Dated, Washington, D.C., January 23, 2018.

MARVIN E. KAPLAN, CHAIRMAN

MARK GASTON PEARCE, MEMBER

LAUREN McFERRAN, MEMBER

---

<sup>1</sup> We are not persuaded by the Proposed-Intervenor's arguments that the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment, and Rule 24(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, require reversal of the administrative law judge's ruling.

# EXHIBIT B



United States Government

**NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD**

**1015 HALF STREET, SE  
WASHINGTON DC 20570**

January 23, 2018

Re: Leggett & Platt, Inc.  
Cases 09-CA-194057 et al.

**ORDER**

The General Counsel's Motion to Strike Proposed-Intervenor's Exceptions to the Administrative Law Judge's Decision and Brief In Support Thereof is granted insofar as the exceptions and supporting brief address matters beyond the issue of intervention. See NLRB Rules and Regulations, Sections 102.1(h) and 102.46(a).

By direction of the Board:

/s/ Farah Z. Qureshi  
Associate Executive Secretary